



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/801,016

03/06/2001

Jeffrey A. Livesay

Wellogix-002:CIP

1305

21897

7590

02/03/2009

THE MATTHEWS FIRM  
2000 BERING DRIVE  
SUITE 700  
HOUSTON, TX 77057

EXAMINER

COLBERT, ELLA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3696

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/03/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/801,016	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LIVESAY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Ella Colbert	<b>Art Unit</b> 3696	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 15, 22-25, 34, 51, 54 and 64 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 15, 22-25, 34, 51, 54 and 64 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-4, 15, 22-25, 34, 51, 54, and 64 are pending. Claims 1, 22, 51, and 64 have been amended in this communication filed 5/22/08 entered as Amendment and RCE.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-4 and 15, drawn to a processing method for reconciling actual data with estimated data within the process for a project ordered by a buyer and performed by a seller, classified in class 705, subclass 1.
- II. Claims 22-25 and 34, drawn to a system for interacting with at least one buyer and at least one seller, the actual data being received from the seller database, and the processor comparing the actual data to the estimated data to determine any discrepancy between the actual data and the estimated data and notifying the buyer and/or the seller via the first interface of any discrepancy, classified in class 707, subclass 100.
- III. Claims 51 and 54, drawn to a process in a system for comparing at least one first response to at least one second response, the at least one first response and the at least one second response being responsive to at least one request by a buyer for either a good or at least one service, classified in class 705, subclass 37.

- IV. Claim 64, drawn to a system with a buyer interface, a seller interface for receiving at least one first response and at least one second response from a seller, a memory for storing the first response and the second response, and a processor connected to a buyer interface, a seller interface, and a memory, with the processor comparing the first response to the second response and the processor presenting the comparison to the buyer via the buyer interface, classified in class 705, subclass 26.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Invention I has a processing method for reconciling actual data with estimated data within the process for a project ordered by a buyer and performed by a seller; Invention II has a system for interacting with at least one buyer and at least one seller, the actual data being received from the seller database, and the processor comparing the actual data to the estimated data to determine any discrepancy between the actual data and the estimated data and notifying the buyer and/or the seller via the first interface of any discrepancy; Invention III has a process in a system for comparing at least one first response to at least one second response, the at least one first response and the at least one second response being responsive to at least one request by a buyer for either a good or at least one service; and Invention IV has a system with a buyer interface, a seller interface for receiving at least one first response and at least one second response from a seller, a memory for storing the first response and the second response, and a processor connected to a buyer interface, a seller interface, and a

Art Unit: 3696

memory, with the processor comparing the first response to the second response and the processor presenting the comparison to the buyer via the buyer interface.

Inventions I, II, III, and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions have different scopes, furthermore they have different modes of operation thus yielding different effects and are not of capable of use together for the reason set forth.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their  
different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their  
recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching  
different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different  
search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to  
another invention;

(e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

**Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.**

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 3696

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ella Colbert whose telephone number is 571-272-6741. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday, 5:30AM-3:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dixon Thomas can be reached on 571-272-6803. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ella Colbert/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3696

August 14, 2008